Strong Transient Modulation of Horizon Radiation

Aida Ahmadzadegan[1, 2] and Achim Kempf[3, 1, 4]

[1] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada*
[2] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia*
[3] *Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*
[4] *Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*

As a black hole grows, its Hawking radiation is not thermal and, depending on the extent to which the Hawking spectrum is modulated, it can carry information about the infalling matter. Analogously, via the equivalence principle, the Unruh spectrum of non-uniformly accelerated trajectories is not thermal and, depending on the extent to which the Unruh radiation is modulated, it can carry information about the trajectory. Here, we calculate the exact extent to which Unruh spectra can be modulated through non-uniform acceleration. We find evidence that the conditions for a strong modulation, and therefore for a strong information-carrying capacity of the spectrum, can realistically be met in the cases of both the Unruh and Hawking effects.

arXiv:1702.00472v2 [gr-qc] 11 Feb 2017

As a black hole accretes matter, its temperature is expected to adapt correspondingly. However, during a period in which the mass is changing, the Hawking radiation [1, 2] may not be thermal, i.e., it may not be of maximum entropy for the given energy. Since this is of interest regarding the black hole information loss problem [3–7], the question arises to what extent the transient Hawking radiation can be modulated.

Here, we study such transient modulation not for Hawking radiation directly but for the easier-to-handle Unruh radiation [8–12] that is detected by accelerated particle detectors in Minkowski space. Unruh and Hawking radiation are closely related via the equivalence principle. A variation in the mass of a black hole implies a variation in its surface gravity, which in the Unruh effect corresponds to a variation in the acceleration of the particle detector.

From the perspective of the Unruh effect, there is indeed reason to expect that horizon radiation can be modulated significantly by variations in the acceleration or, via the equivalence principle, by variations in a black hole's surface gravity. To see this, we begin by recalling the mechanism behind the Unruh effect. First, any quantum system that can act as a detector of field quanta must contain a charge in order to couple to the field. As the detector is accelerated so is its charge and it will, therefore, radiate, i.e, it will excite the quantum field. The quantum field backreacts by exciting the detector, which is then interpreted as the detector registering Unruh radiation. The formation of a horizon is not strictly necessary for the Unruh effect to occur.

For accelerated classical charges, backreaction effects, such as the Abraham Lorentz force [13] or Feynman and Wheeler's radiation resistance [14], are known to be sensitive to variations in acceleration. It is, therefore, plausible that the Unruh effect can also be significantly modulated by variations in a particle detector's acceleration, i.e., by higher-than-second derivatives in the detector's trajectory. For prior work on detectors with non-uniform acceleration, see, in particular, [15–23]. In the present paper, our main goal is to determine to what extent the Unruh effect can be enhanced or suppressed by a suitable choice of non-uniformly accelerated trajectory, as compared to the uniformly accelerated trajectory with the same initial and final velocities.

While we will not carry out an information theoretic analysis here, the underlying motivation is ultimately information theoretic. Therefore, we will not calculate the magnitude of the overall Unruh effect. Instead, we will calculate for each elementary Unruh process separately how its probability amplitude is affected by non-uniformity of the acceleration. By an elementary Unruh process we mean a process in which the accelerated detector creates a field quantum of momentum $\boldsymbol{k}$ while transitioning from its ground state of energy E_0 into an excited state of energy E_1.

For simplicity, we consider a free scalar field and we model particle detectors as localized first-quantized two-level systems, so-called Unruh-DeWitt (UDW) detectors with interaction Hamiltonian [9, 11, 24–28]:

$$\hat{H}_{\rm I} = \lambda\chi(\tau)\hat{\mu}(\tau)\hat{\phi}\left(\mathbf{x}(\tau), t(\tau)\right) \tag{1}$$

Here, τ is the proper time of the UDW detector, $(t(\tau), \boldsymbol{x}(\tau))$ is its trajectory, and $\hat{\phi}\left(x(\tau)\right)$ is the field along the trajectory. λ is a small coupling constant and $\chi(\tau) \geq 0$ is a window function to switch the detector. $\hat{\mu}(\tau)$ is the detector's monopole moment operator:

$$\hat{\mu}(\tau) = (\hat{\sigma}^+ e^{{\rm i}\tau\Delta E} + \hat{\sigma}^- e^{-{\rm i}\tau\Delta E}) \tag{2}$$

Here, $\Delta E = E_1 - E_0$ is the proper energy gap between the ground state, $|E_0\rangle$, and the excited state, $|E_1\rangle$, of the detector. In Minkowski space, the first-order probability amplitude for an UDW detector to register a particle, i.e., to transition from its ground to its excited state, $|E_0\rangle \to |E_1\rangle$ while creating a particle of momentum $\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ from the vacuum is given by [26],

$$\psi_k(\Delta E) = \eta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} {\rm e}^{{\rm i}\Delta E\,\tau} {\rm e}^{{\rm i}(\omega_k t(\tau) - \boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{x}(\tau))} \chi(\tau) d\tau, \tag{3}$$

where $\eta = \frac{\mathrm{i}\lambda\langle E|\hat{\mu}_0|E_0\rangle}{(16\pi^3\omega_k)^{1/2}}$. Apart from a constant prefactor, $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ is the Fourier transform of the τ-dependent function $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\omega_k t(\tau)-\boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{x}(\tau))}$.

If an always-on detector, $\chi(\tau) \equiv 1$, is on an inertial trajectory through the origin with a velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$, then $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\omega_k t(\tau)-\boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{x}(\tau))} = e^{\mathrm{i}\tau(\omega_k-\boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{v})(1-\boldsymbol{v}^2)^{-1/2}} = e^{\mathrm{i}\bar{\omega}\tau}$, yielding $\psi_k(\Delta E) = 2\pi\eta\delta(\Delta E + \bar{\omega})$. Since $\Delta E \geq 0$ and $\bar{\omega} = (\omega_k - \boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{v})(1-\boldsymbol{v}^2)^{-1/2} > 0$, we have $\psi_k(\Delta E) = 0$, i.e., an always-on inertial detector will not get excited. ($\psi_k(\Delta E)$ is non-vanishing for a suitable $\Delta E < 0$. This is the case of an initially excited detector that decays while emitting a field quantum of momentum $\boldsymbol{k}$).

Here, we are interested in the amplitude, $\psi_k(\Delta E)$, for an Unruh process to occur, i.e., for an accelerated detector that starts in the ground state (i.e., $\Delta E > 0$) to get excited in the Minkowski vacuum. This amplitude can be nonzero because of the mathematical phenomenon that a wave that monotonically changes its frequency within a certain (e.g., negative) frequency interval will have a Fourier transform which contains also frequencies outside that interval, including positive frequencies. The occurrence of such *concomitant frequencies,* is at the heart of the Unruh effect: Intuitively, $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\omega_k t(\tau)-\boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{x}(\tau))}$ runs through a set of positive values for $\bar{\omega}$, which should prevent excitation. The Fourier transform, $\psi_k(\Delta E)$, generally shows, however, the presence of both positive and negative frequencies in $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\omega_k t(\tau)-\boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{x}(\tau))}$, i.e., the probability amplitude $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ is nonzero also for $\Delta E > 0$.

A simple example is a detector with constant acceleration, a, and trajectory $(t(\tau), x(\tau)) = (\sinh(a\tau)/a, \cosh(a\tau)/a, 0, 0)$ with $\boldsymbol{k} = (1, 1, 0, 0)$ and $\chi(\tau) \equiv 1$. The Fourier integral Eq.3 can be solved using the Gamma function:

$$\psi_k(\Delta E) = \frac{\mu}{a}\sqrt{\frac{\Delta E}{\omega_k}}e^{-\frac{\pi\Delta E}{2a}}e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\Delta E}{a}\ln(\frac{\omega_k}{a})}\Gamma(-\mathrm{i}\Delta E/a). \quad (4)$$

Another example is an always-on detector which, for a finite amount of time, is accelerated so that the frequency increases linearly, preceded and followed by inertial motion. Fig.1 shows the Fourier transforms $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ for this trajectory and for a trajectory of uniform acceleration. Both exhibit the presence of concomitant frequencies, including finite amplitudes for positive ΔE which cause the Unruh effect: We expect the Fourier transform for the trajectory of temporary acceleration to contain frequencies within the interval from the initial to the final frequency (on the negative half axis), as well as a peak at either end of the interval because the initial and final velocities are maintained for an infinite amount of time. The Fourier transform contains these features as well as concomitant frequencies on the negative and positive ΔE axes. Similarly the case of the trajectory of uniform acceleration is expected to contain frequencies on the negative ΔE half axis but it also has support on the positive half axis.



Figure 1. The Fourier transform, $|\psi_k(\Delta E)|$, for a trajectory of uniform acceleration (dashed) and a trajectory of temporary acceleration (solid) with the frequencies running through the interval $(5, 80)$. The finite amplitudes on the positive axis show the concomitant frequencies that cause the Unruh effect.

Our aim now is to study the origin of the phenomenon of concomitant frequencies in order to determine how strong and how weak the phenomenon can be made, i.e., to what extent $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ can be modulated by choosing trajectories with suitable non-uniform accelerations.

Before we do so, we need to separate off another effect which can also lead to detector excitations in the vacuum, namely the effect of a switching of the detector through a nontrivial function $\chi(\tau)$. Assume that the detector is inertial, which means that in Eq.3 the complete integrand, $u(\tau) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\Delta E\tau}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(\omega_k t(\tau)-\boldsymbol{k}.\boldsymbol{x}(\tau))}$, takes the form $u(\tau) = e^{\mathrm{i}\int_0^\tau \omega(\tau')\,d\tau'}$ with $\omega(\tau') \equiv \omega$ and $\omega > 0$. Then if the detector is switched on for an integer number of cycles of the integrand, its integral $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ vanishes, $\int_0^{2\pi N/\omega} e^{\mathrm{i}\omega\tau}d\tau = 0$.

However, if the detector is kept on for a non-integer number of cycles (or if $\chi(\tau)$ is a generic smooth switching function), then $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ is finite. The effect is maximal for a half integer number of cycles, in which case $|\psi_k(\Delta E)| = 2/\omega$. Physically, the finite probability for an inertial detector to click due to this truncation effect expresses the time-energy uncertainty principle. Our interest here, however, is not in the time-energy uncertainty principle but in the phenomenon of concomitant frequencies. Therefore, we now investigate the contribution, $\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)$, of an integer number, N, of complete cycles of the integrand in Eq.3, to the $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ of an always-on detector.

We can thereby trace the origin of concomitant frequencies (and acceleration-induced detector clicks in the vacuum) to the fact that the integral over N complete cycles does not need to be zero if the frequency changes during the N cycles. Consider an always-on detector with a trajectory with an integer number, N, of cycles completed in the time interval $[0, \tau_f]$, i.e., $u(0) = u(\tau_f) = 1$. In the integrand $u(\tau) = e^{\mathrm{i}\int_0^\tau \omega(\tau')\,d\tau'}$, when the detector accelerates (or decelerates), $\omega(\tau') > 0$ is a monotonically

increasing (or decreasing) function.

We arrive at the extremization problem to find those monotonic functions, $\omega(\tau')$, obeying $0 < \omega(0) < \omega(\tau_f)$ which extremize

$$|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)| = \left| \int_0^{\tau_f} e^{\mathrm{i} \int_0^\tau \omega(\tau')d\tau'} d\tau \right| \tag{5}$$

while completing N cycles. Given $\omega(\tau)$, corresponding trajectories, differing by directions, can then be reconstructed straightforwardly. The question is which $\omega(\tau)$ and corresponding trajectories, i.e., which accelerations as a function of time, contribute maximally or minimally to $\psi_k(\Delta E)$ for fixed $\boldsymbol{k}, \Delta E$, N and for fixed initial and final velocities.

We can solve the corresponding constrained variational problem by using symmetry considerations. To this end, we change the integration variable in Eq.5 by defining $v(\tau) := \int_0^\tau \omega(\tau')d\tau'$, so that $d\tau/dv = 1/\omega(\tau(v))$:

$$\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E) = \int_0^{2\pi N} e^{\mathrm{i}v} \frac{1}{\omega(\tau(v))}\, dv \tag{6}$$

The extremization problem is now to find those monotonic functions $\omega(\tau(v))$ which extremize $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$. The integral is equivalent to calculating the center of mass of a wire of length $2\pi N$ coiled up N times on the unit circle in the complex plane with the wire's mass density at length v being $1/\omega(\tau(v))$. The problem of maximizing $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ is now to monotonically vary the mass density of the wire between its prescribed initial and final values $1/\omega(0)$ and $1/\omega(\tau(2\pi N))$ such that the center of mass of the coiled-up wire is as much as possible off center.

For $N = 1$, the answer is clearly to put as much mass as possible on one half circle and as little as possible on the other half. This means that $|\psi_k^{(1)}(\Delta E)|$ is maximal if the initial ω is maintained, $\omega(\tau(\nu)) \equiv \omega(0)$, in the first half of the cycle and then the frequency is abruptly changed to the final frequency which is then maintained, $\omega(\tau(\nu)) \equiv \omega(2\pi)$, for the second half of the cycle. All acceleration happens abruptly mid cycle. The maximum is, therefore:

$$|\psi_k^{(1)}(\Delta E)| = \left| \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{\mathrm{i}v}}{\omega(\tau(v))}\, dv \right| = 2 \left| \frac{1}{\omega(0)} - \frac{1}{\omega(\tau_f)} \right| \tag{7}$$

For $N > 1$, by the same argument, it is optimal to pursue this acceleration regime in one of the cycles and to have all prior and subsequent cycles at constant velocity. Eq.7 also shows that the effect of concomitant frequencies can grow as large as $2\max(1/\omega(0), 1/\omega(\tau(2\pi)))$ which is the maximal size of the truncation effect due to the time-energy uncertainty principle.

Conversely, there are trajectories over N cycles that contribute minimally to $|\psi_k(\Delta E)|$. These are the trajectories where all accelerations are abrupt and occur only at the beginnings (or ends) of cycles. In this way, all cycles are individually monochromatic and do not contribute. The minimum is, therefore, $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)| = 0$.

We conclude that suitable non-uniform acceleration over N cycles is able to modulate the amplitude, $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$, for individual Unruh processes within the range $(0, 2\,|1/\omega(0) - 1/\omega(\tau_f)|)$.

This confirms our expectation that suitable nonzero higher-than-second derivatives in trajectories can significantly modulate the Unruh amplitudes $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$. However, these trajectories are unrealistic in the sense that they are distributional by requiring a sudden contribution of arbitrarily large higher derivatives. The question arises to what extent $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ can be modulated by trajectories that are regular in the sense that they possess only a few nonzero higher derivatives and to what extent such trajectories can enhance the Unruh effect compared to trajectories of uniform acceleration with the same initial and final velocities.

In order to calculate those trajectories that optimize $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ when allowing only finitely many derivatives to be nonzero, we solved the problem of constrained optimization of $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ by finding a suitable trajectory numerically. The trajectory is indirectly represented by a polynomial function, $\omega(\tau)$, of a pre-determined maximal degree, which is monotonically increasing between set initial and final values, within a fixed integer number, N, of cycles.



Figure 2. The velocity, $v(\tau)$, for a straight line trajectory of uniform acceleration (dashed), and the velocity $v(\tau)$ of a polynomial straight line trajectory that is orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{k}$, of degree 13 and optimizes $|\psi_k^{(3)}(\Delta E)|$ over three cycles (solid).

We remark that since $\omega(\tau)$ is not the trajectory itself, its polynomial expansion is not the same as the standard expansion of a trajectory in terms of acceleration, jerk, snap and higher derivatives, which was used, for example, in the analysis of non-uniform trajectories in [15]. Fig.2 compares a trajectory of constant acceleration with the trajectory that maximizes $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ among all trajectories of polynomial degree $n \leq 13$ for $N = 3$ cycles and

the same overall change in velocity. We notice that the latter trajectory involves alternating periods of diminished and enhanced acceleration. We can now address to what extent a trajectory with non-uniform acceleration can increase the probability for an elementary Unruh process to occur.

To this end we compare, in Fig.3, the moduli of the probability amplitudes $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ for elementary Unruh processes for an optimal trajectory (which is of distributional acceleration), for a regular trajectory of non-uniform acceleration that is polynomial of a given degree, and for a trajectory of uniform acceleration, all with the same initial and final velocities. We see that the larger the difference between the initial and final velocities, the more $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ can be enhanced by a trajectory of non-uniform acceleration.



Figure 3. (a) Contribution to $|\psi_k(\Delta E)|$ by one cycle, as a function of $\Delta\omega$ for a trajectory of constant acceleration (circles), for a polynomial trajectory (triangles), and for a trajectory with a distributional acceleration (squares). (b) Relative enhancement of elementary Unruh processes: the two curves show the ratio of the two upper curves by the lowest curve of Fig.3a. Here, the initial frequency is $\omega(0) = 5$ and the energy gap of the detector is $\Omega = 3$.

We asked to what extent the Hawking spectrum can be modulated by a black hole's growth, and therefore to what extent the modulated Hawking radiation can carry away information about the infalling matter. Via the equivalence principle, this motivated us to determine the extent to which the Unruh spectrum of non-uniformly accelerated trajectories can be modulated.

Technically, we asked how much the probability for an individual Unruh process can be enhanced by choosing a trajectory of suitable non-uniform acceleration while holding fixed the initial and final velocities and the number of cycles. We found that the probability for an Unruh process can be enhanced strongly over its probability for a trajectory of uniform acceleration. $|\psi_k^{(N)}(\Delta E)|$ can reach as high as $2\,|1/\omega(0) - 1/\omega(\tau_f)|$, whose magnitude is comparable to $\max(2/\omega(0), 2/\omega(\tau_f))$, which is the maximal size of the effect due to a sudden switching of the detector. The effect of sudden switching of an UDW detector is known to be very large in the sense that in 3+1 dimensional Minkowski space the cumulative excitation probability obtained by integrating $|\psi_k(\Delta E)|^2$ over all modes $\boldsymbol{k}$, diverges [11, 12, 29].

Further, we determined the condition for the modulation of $|\psi_k(\Delta E)|$ to be strong by analysing the origin of concomitant frequencies. We found that the condition is that there is a significant change in frequency within one cycle, i.e, that the trajectory is non-adiabatic in this sense. Let us now estimate if this condition can realistically be met in the cases of the Unruh and Hawking effects. The Unruh temperature for a trajectory of uniform acceleration, a, is $T = a/2\pi$, with the dominant radiation at a wavelength of $\lambda \approx 1/a$, in natural units. Therefore, to significantly modulate the dominant Unruh processes, the acceleration needs to significantly change at or below the time scale $\lambda \approx 1/a$.

Via the equivalence principle, this indicates that for the dominant modes of Hawking radiation to be modulated significantly by an infalling body, the black hole should settle after accreting the body at a time scale which is at or below the oscillation time scale of the dominant wavelength of the Hawking radiation. Since both time scales are of the order of the formal light crossing time of the Schwarzschild radius, our results indicate that the spectrum of Hawking radiation can be significantly modulated by the transient non-adiabaticity caused by infalling matter. It remains to extend our results to determine the amount of classical and quantum information about the infalling body encoded in the modulated Hawking radiation.

To this end, also the calculation of β coefficients of Bogolubov transformations can be viewed as the calculation of generalized concomitant frequencies. Each mode decomposition is a definition of what constitutes positive frequencies. By changing the mode decompositions, negative frequencies can arise from positive ones, and vice versa, leading to nonzero β coefficients and particle production. For example, in the case of uniform acceleration, the same integral as that leading to Eq.4 arises in the calculation [30] of the Bogolubov β coefficients. The present optimization analysis of concomitant frequencies should be generalizable to general Bogolubov transformations, including those for Hawking radiation.

Acknowledgments.- AK acknowledges support through the Discovery Grant Program of the Canadian National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC). AA and AK acknowledge helpful feedback from E. Martín-Martínez, R. B. Mann and J. Louko.

[1] S. W. Hawking, Nature **248**, 30 (1974).
[2] S. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).
[3] L. Susskind and J. Lindesay, *An Introduction to Black Holes, Information and the String Theory Revolution: The Holographic Universe* (World Scientific, 2005).
[4] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, JHEP **09**, 120 (2007).
[5] D. Harlow, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 015002 (2016).
[6] C. Adami and G. L. Ver Steeg, Class. Quant. Grav. **31**, 075015 (2014).
[7] S. B. Giddings, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 106005 (2006).
[8] W. Unruh, Physical Review D **14**, 870 (1976).
[9] B. DeWitt, *General Relativity; an Einstein Centenary Survey* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1980).
[10] L. C. B. Crispino, A. Higuchi, and G. E. A. Matsas, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 787 (2008).
[11] J. Louko and A. Satz, Class.Quant.Grav. **25**, 055012 (2008).
[12] J. Louko and A. Satz, Class.Quant.Grav. **23**, 6321 (2006).
[13] P. R. Johnson and B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 065015 (2002).
[14] J. A. Wheeler and R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **17**, 157 (1945).
[15] L. C. Barbado and M. Visser, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 084011 (2012).
[16] M. H. Lynch, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 024019 (2015).
[17] M. Smerlak and S. Singh, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 104023 (2013).
[18] E. Martín-Martínez, D. Aasen, and A. Kempf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 160501 (2013).
[19] A. Ahmadzadegan, R. B. Mann, and E. Martín-Martínez, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062107 (2014).
[20] J. Doukas, S.-Y. Lin, B. L. Hu, and R. B. Mann, JHEP **2013**, 119 (2013).
[21] P. Corona-Ugalde, E. Martín-Martínez, C. M. Wilson, and R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012519 (2016).
[22] S.-Y. Lin, arXiv:1601.07006 (2016).
[23] D. C. Ostapchuk, S.-Y. Lin, R. B. Mann, and B. Hu, JHEP **1207**, 072 (2012).
[24] M. Scully and M. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1997).
[25] E. Martín-Martínez, M. Montero, and M. del Rey, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 064038 (2013).
[26] N. Birrell and P. Davies, *Quantum fields in curved space* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1984).
[27] A. M. Alhambra, A. Kempf, and E. Martin-Martinez, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 033835 (2014).
[28] A. Pozas-Kerstjens and E. Martín-Martínez, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 064074 (2016).
[29] P. C. W. Davies and A. C. Ottewill, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 104014 (2002).
[30] V. Mukhanov and S. Winitzki, *Introduction to Quantum Effects in Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2007).